

Why can't the Men's Movement get its act together?

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[10.3.10]

Some say the Men's Movement is ineffective because the Feminists are so successful at turning men into androgynies that there are probably only a couple of hundred men left in America. If true, it's not easy for such a small group to change the course of 300 million.

Some, however, argue ego. Men are too aggressive and opinionated—they just can't cooperate. Yet, practically all the great social changes in history, for good or ill, occurred because men worked together.

Others claim an absence of organization with too many groups going in too many different directions. But there are hundreds of Feminist organizations spread across the land doing lots of different activities and focused on different goals, although a uniting factor may be their inherent fear and hatred of men.

The lack of success by the Men's Movement isn't for want of talent or will. It has skillful public speakers and writers trying to educate, elucidate and enlighten; competent litigators trying to put the blindfold back across the eyes of Justice; effective lobbyists exercising their First Amendment right of association; and gutsy demonstrators willing to fight for their rights no matter how many names the "morality pundits" call them.

So why can't the Men's Movement effectively fight the Feminists? In this capitalistic society—it's money, the primary source of power in America. The federal government gives Feminist organizations hundreds of millions of dollars a year while foundations, corporations, and individuals chip in millions more.

Organizations advocating for the rights of men receive next to nothing, and it's unlikely to change. Politicians run the government, and they generally take positions that will win the most votes, which means catering to the female majority. Foundations, as with most of the non-governmental sector, are largely run by products of university Women's Studies programs, which issue degrees in backstabbing men. Corporations, of course, follow the dollar, and with 80% of the purchases made by females, corporations aren't about to donate to men's groups.

As for private individuals, although most of the billionaires in America are males, their wealth often depends on corporations, so they aren't about to alienate their largest market. Besides, a by-product of feminism was to expand the labor pool, which lowered the cost of labor—the largest expense for most corporations. Working and middle class men still believe the government will treat them fairly if they end up in a dispute with a female. Those who know the truth, however, have very little money left after fighting a government that not only doesn't give a damn about them, but actually rejoices in the number of their lives it can destroy. The rest of the populace simply follows the trends of the day with many too scared to have their names associated with groups against which popular culture directs its hostility.

The future prospect of the Men's Movement raising enough money to exercise some influence in America is unlikely. But there is one remaining source of power in which men still have a near monopoly—firearms. At some point, the men in this country will take the Declaration of Independence literally:

“[W]hen a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new guards for their future security.”

Dollars of war

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

Serbians cried havoc and let loose the dogs of war in Bosnia during the 1990s, butchering between 150,000 and 200,000 people, mostly civilians, many of them children. The Serbian demonic fires of intolerance tore men from their families for summary execution and ignominious burial in mass graves while children of all ages became targets for the entertainment of Serbian sharp shooters and artillery crews.

Serbian politicians, with financial backing from their bankers, intentionally pumped the bellows of ancient wrongs to forge a searing, mindless hatred of Bosnian Muslims. In a ruthless pragmatic pursuit of individual wealth and power, Serbia's President and its chief financier unleashed the stoked hatred on millions of their former countrymen through the savage use of tanks, airplanes, and artillery. The President and chief financier claimed a divine right to defend Serbian Christians by which they really meant: "Since we have the power to take the lands and steal the wealth of our Muslim neighbors, we will."

As with most ethnic, religious, and nationalistic wars, politicians and financiers utterly destroy the hopes and aspirations of millions of innocent people. The politicians and financiers embrace barbarity as their means to make it big regardless of the blood they must spill, bodies they must rip open, or agony they must inflict. While the politicians order the troops into battle, the financiers bear much of the guilt for the slaughter because without the money to buy the weapons and pay the butchers, politicians could not launch wars of atrocities.

The Serbs key financier who profited the most from the pain of tearing flesh was a relentlessly greedy female with a fondness for large jewels. Dajana Milanovic ran Serbia's largest bank that financed the war in Bosnia and kept the Serbian economy afloat in the face of United Nations economic sanctions. This icon of new age Feminism financed weapons smuggling, ethnic cleansing, and the successful elections of Slobodan Milošević as Serbian President. Hell hath no fury as a female bent on money.

Fear corrupts

[12.25.10]

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

The purpose of the Feminist Movement is not equality, justice or freedom, but power—power over men.

Virtually every female lives with a never-ending fear that just about any man has the physical power to do with her as he wishes. He can beat her up, rape or kill her with his bare hands; providing no one else is present to prevent it. She does, however, have recourse to the courts, and if she is dead, the prosecutor will try to avenge her, but when a female faces a man in a situation of imminent physical violence, she's powerless.

This lack of physical power to protect their own being has driven many females to an uncontrollable fury and madness that has spawned an insidious, malicious obsession to control men totally by gutting their freedom of thought and speech and relegating them to the non-human status of beasts.

Feminists, or more appropriately Feminazis, use well-proven totalitarian tricks to reach this end. They propagandize their goal as liberation of all females, but in reality they aim to warp society's institutions into a big sister that relentlessly attacks, humiliates, demoralizes, and destroys men.

The Feminazis profess their aim is to raise the consciousness of men and females, but they are actually carrying out a campaign of indoctrination and social pressure backed by the force of government. Their true goal is to domesticate and intimidate men into sheepish little boys who will blindly obey their self-righteous, hypocritical, and bigoted whims.

Having tasted social power, the Feminazis will not stop until they reshape America and eventually the world into an intolerant hell complete with thought-control, inquisitions, enslavement, and, as one Feminazi priestess advocated, a reduction in the male population to 25%. Perhaps the reduced male population will be kept in "protective hamlets" surrounded by armed guards and barbed wire where females can safely pick out their pleasure for the night and where females' fears remain entombed.

A female's invisible weapon

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[12.25.10]

Physical violence injures the body while emotional distress sears the mind.

Contemporary Feminist groups and the political-correctionalist media and politicians incessantly depict husbands and boyfriends as brutal batterers of their innocent, defenseless wives or girlfriends. They ignore, however, the incapacitating, genetically-programmed violence of emotional distress that wives and girlfriends batter guys with day after day, year after year, sending the man to an early grave or bankruptcy defending against a fraudulent lawsuit.

Females intentionally or recklessly inflict emotional pain on a man with words, lies, intonation of voice, facial demeanor, and acts or patterns of behavior. For example, every time a guy leaves the refrigerator door open for more than some arbitrarily time limit set by his wife or girlfriend, the domineering paragon of everything allegedly correct barks, "shut the door!" Over time, opening the refrigerator can become an unpleasant task—not unlike touching a live wire.

Or the keeping of letters from the wife's lover in a place where the husband is likely to find them so as to shatter the world of a faithful husband—especially when the wife's sexual escapades occurred in the year prior to the birth of a child. Such an evil female well knows that a nauseating doubt will plague the husband until the day he dies that the child is not his. What redress for the pain she caused does the husband have in Feminarchy America—none!

Girls have the advantage because physical violence is easy to prove: it leaves physical marks that a camera can record. Emotional violence, however, stalks the invisible world of the mind, which makes it a near perfect weapon. Husbands and boyfriends can't take pictures of the pain females cause them. Girls know that, and Big Sister America is using that fact to literally tie men's hands, so they can no longer defend against their girlfriends or wives twisting the blade of emotional pain through their hearts.

You never see advertisements paid for with taxpayer dollars that give men a number to call to throw some ragging, nagging, malicious-mouthing female in jail. That wouldn't happen until science invents a technique for measuring emotional distress. In the meantime, a man has no choice but to follow Mother Nature, regardless of the cost, and slap the shrew upside the head to stop the barrage of emotional bullets spewing from her tongue, which, of course, has always been a girl's gun.

Preaching Feminist religion in Women's Studies

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[12.25.10]

The only problem with Women's Studies is that it preaches Feminism: a belief system that advocates an accident of nature, born a girl, makes females superior to men in all matters under the sun. Men are deemed guilty until they prove themselves innocent, females are innocent until proven guilty, and even then, it's still a guy's fault.

Women's Studies programs preach females are oppressed by a patriarchal society. Oppressed compared to whom—princesses in fairy tales? If you want to know who the real oppressors are just look at who lives longer, who controls a greater percentage of the wealth, on whom more money is spent for health, who receives less jail time for the same crimes, and who's proportionally fatter. It's not guys.

If anything, America is a *de facto* matriarchy. Females can murder incipient human beings (abortion), newborns, young kids, boyfriends, and husbands with little or no punishment. The Voodoo science of Women's Studies is largely responsible for all those lunatic female syndromes that excuse ladies for killing others. If men were really running the show, that wouldn't happen.

Yet Feminists argue America is a patriarchy because men hold most of the jobs above the glass-ceiling. That's true, but real power is not in who holds a position but in what they believe. Women's Studies programs have successfully created in universities and society a Feminist Establishment, a unitary belief system held by enough influential persons so as to dominate over other beliefs, including those on which the Constitution is based. Over the past 40 years, Feminists have so scared males that they no longer believe in nor will they fight for their rights. As a result, there few men left, but a lot of androgynies.

That may make the ladies feel powerful, but who's going to defend them against a real threat. Don't forget that if it weren't for men, many females would now be Nazi broodmares, Japanese comfort-girls, or Commie secretutes.

Women's Studies programs claim to want equality, but in reality their aim and achievements are preferential treatment. In New York State, 57% of undergrads are females while 63% of master's degrees and over a majority of doctorates go to females. Throughout the country, girls earn more per unit of time worked and unit of risk incurred. Females can commit perjury in court with no punishment, receive custody of children and hidden alimony 80% of the time, and they don't have to register for the draft. Women's Studies programs aren't out for a meritocracy, not even a quota-ocracy but a "hypocracy."

Women's Studies programs feed on demonizing, denigrating, and discrediting men—blaming them for all the World's evils while exalting females as innocent, virtuous victims. For example, the programs claim men cause the wars. Tell that to the guys pushing up daises in the Falkland Islands. And don't forget the influence of Condoleezza Rice on the current wars, April Glassbie on the first Iraq war, the 1.8 million more females than men who voted for Lyndon Johnson,

Woodrow Wilson's wife refusing to compromise with Sen. Henry Cabot Lodge so America could join the League of Nations, Queen Victoria's Boar Wars in which the brutality of concentration camps was perfected, Catherine the Great of Russia, and others. No, when females are in a position of power they are just as likely to abuse it and perhaps more so, since they feel compelled to look tough.

My lawsuit against Columbia's Women Studies program was just one of three that tried, unsuccessfully, to win back the rights of guys trampled by Feminism. That case made two basic accusations: violation of equal protection and the government aiding a religion. On equal protection, think of Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972. Title IX requires universities to offer girls equivalent athletic opportunities as those offered to guys. The same requirement applies to all educational programs—not just athletics—whenever a university receives financial assistance from the federal government.

Columbia received such assistance, so it was violating Title IX by not having an equivalent program for guys or not eliminating its Women's Studies. Sure guys could take Women's Studies courses, but they were of no benefit to them; just like a girl taking a male sport—she'll spend her time on the bench. In Women's Studies the guy will spend his time being walked over by girls in their stiletto heels—hmmm that might not be so bad.

On the religion issue, New York and the Feds provided Columbia assistance that benefited the Women's Studies program. Since the gospel of the Women's Studies program is the belief system Feminism, the State and Feds were aiding a religion. A religion need not have gods or goddesses, but does include irrationality, a trait not unknown to Feminists and females, and acting in accordance with a belief that is against one's interest, that is doing something stupid, another trait not unknown to Feminists and females.

Had the federal court concluded that Feminism was a religion, then every Women's Studies program across the land that pushes Feminism would have ended, the hundreds of millions of dollars a year that the federal government gives to Feminist organizations under the Violence Against Women Act would have ended, and every bit of state or local help given to programs with a Feminist slant would have stopped. Feminists would finally have been on their own to prove whether they were really the strong and independent persons they proclaim to be.

Fighting the Violence Against Women Act (9.19.10)

The federal Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”) pays the legal fees for most, of the foreigners who trick New Yorkers and other American citizens into marriage. Sometimes it’s a foreign man deceiving a lady, but usually it’s a foreign femme fatal conniving for a green card.

Some ladies from the former Soviet Union go so far as to secretly feed drugs to their prospective husbands. Ingenious, since the man thinks the euphoria of the drugs actually comes from his girlfriend’s affections.

After marriage, the citizen husband often realizes his marriage is a fraud, so he demands a divorce. If the divorce comes within two years of the wedding, it will likely end the wife’s dream of a green card because Homeland Security’s Immigration division will start deportation proceedings. However, she can avoid deportation by simply accusing her husband of domestic violence.

It doesn’t matter whether she’s lying or not. Just on her say-so, Immigration will hold a secret proceeding to determine whether the husband did what she accused him of doing. The husband will not receive any notice of the proceeding. If he somehow learns about it, Immigration will not let him participate, and it will throw in the garbage any evidence from him of his innocence. No wonder Immigration usually finds the husband committed abuse.

Immigration’s so-called fact-findings of domestic violence are forever kept secret from the husband but not feminist organizations that provide the wife benefits, law enforcement, and some state agencies.

VAWA pays for the wife’s lawyer to not only represent her before Immigration but in divorce court and just about any state action in which she accuses him of abuse, such as false police and court complaints that result in the arrest, criminal prosecution and orders of protection against the husband. VAWA also pays the feminist organization that the wife uses to advise her on how to acquire a green card. Of course, the husband has to pay his own legal expenses.

This leaves the husband in the untenable position of using his resources to legally battle his wife’s attorney and feminist advisor. Since they are paid by the federal government, they’ll have the wife file any number of complaints and actions. They don’t care; they’re being paid.

But there’s a way to actually make them pay, and that will deter the fraudulent state proceedings they bring against a husband. He can file a federal Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization lawsuit against the wife, her attorney, her feminist advisor and the federal government.

VAWA does not pay the legal costs for RICO defendants. As defendants, the wife, her lawyer, and her feminist advisor will have to pay their own legal fees while the federal government will have to divert resources to its defense.

RICO may not stop the fraudulent efforts of foreign females to gain a green card, lawyers to profit by violating the rights of others or feminists from bankrupting another man—but they'll never forget the price they paid in dollars to defend against a RICO lawsuit.

For more information on VAWA, go to www.saveservices.org

Finding information and security in Russia

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[12.25.10]

American security firms know next to nothing about finding information in Russia, dealing with Russians, or protecting a western executive and his company in Russia. In America, it's a different story because the threats are different. American corporations worry about nuts with guns and disgruntled employees who try to sabotage a company's operations.

In Russia, the threats are experienced killers with bazookas and powerful political allies. It's a different game that American security or private detective agencies cannot handle. Although in their arrogance over winning the Cold War, they thought they could.

American security firms tried to analyze Russian institutions and people by drawing analogies to American. It didn't work. The two social, political, economic, and cultural systems are too different to assume what works in America works in Russia. Russia is basically a land of RICOs fighting each other for power and money.

Once American security firms realized this, they started hiring Russian detective agencies to do their work for them. The Americans marked up the price to their westerner clients by 250% or more over what the Russian firms charged. The American firms became nothing more than middlemen who passed along the services of Russian firms to western clients.

Some American firms then started hiring Russians in the hope of providing services themselves and increasing profits by cutting out the Russian firms, but there were problems with this.

1. The Russian employees were still controlled by Americans who just did not understand Russia. Sometimes an American manager did not even live in Russia but visited periodically and tried to manage operations by telephone, which was ineffective and actually increased operation costs.
2. Any Russian with the connections necessary to provide security and conduct investigations went into business with other Russians and made more selling their services to American security firms than working as employees for such.

That's the supply side of the problem in using American security firms in Russia. On the demand side, western companies balk at the high prices American firms charged. This often causes them to forego a necessary investigation or security precautions.

So why don't western corporations and clients go directly to the Russian security firms. Because western businessmen know how to deal with and read other westerners—not Russians. Just by meeting and asking a few questions, a western businessman can get a feel for the honesty and competence of another westerner. For instance, where a person went to college and the degree obtained tells a lot.

In order for Russian security firms to cut out American security firms as the middlemen simply requires them to hire a westerner as marketer and editor of their reports to western companies. That way, western clients can save money but still feel confident in hiring a Russian firm because they are dealing with a western businessman representing the Russian firm. And a Russian security firm can charge somewhat more, but still less than the American security firms.

No more free drinks ladies
By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.
[9.10.10]

One of the most influential courts in the country recently decided that nightclubs can charge men for admission while at the same time letting ladies in for free. Sounds like discrimination, but the federal Second Circuit Court of Appeals says its okay under the Constitution.

The ruling came in a challenge to “Ladies’ Nights” brought by the author of this article. The court’s ruling now allows nightclubs to set any price, no matter how high, for men or even ladies to enter a club or bar that serves alcohol. Naturally, any club wanting to keep out members of one sex—other than those who are Wall Street moguls—can now do so under the Constitution.

The court’s decision, however, does not support charging men more for drinks than ladies. It actually provides authority that pricing drinks differently for the two sexes is unconstitutional. So if a guy can sneak in and get to the bar before being bounced, a nightclub can’t charge him more for a drink.

Sounds schizophrenic, but the court had no choice; otherwise, it would have to overrule two federal cases that say it’s unconstitutional for bars to refuse to serve females. The Feminists would not like that, and most judges are scared of the Feminists or Feminists themselves.

The way the U.S. Constitution works is that for nightclubs to discriminate in violation of it, the discrimination must somehow involve the state. It’s called “state action.” Since, according to the court, the state is only involved in licensing the serving of alcohol and no alcohol is served in entering a club, there’s no state action on admission. But that also means that at the bar where alcohol is served, state action must exist because without a license no alcoholic drinks can be provided.

As a result of this federal decision, men, anywhere in the country, can now challenge Ladies Nights when bars charge them more for drinks, and they will have a decent shot of winning (assuming the judge is not ideologically corrupted by Feminism). This is important because most Ladies’ Nights outside of New York City charge men more for drinks rather than more for admission. The Second Circuit judges obviously didn’t realize this or they would have come up with a different illogical argument.

Ladies' Nights are not children's or seniors' nights

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[12.25.10]

Feminists argue that giving girls a break on Ladies' Nights by charging them less for admission or drinks is the same as giving children and seniors discounts on meals. And since reduced prices for children and seniors are legal, so are reduced prices for females at nightclubs.

The Feminists, however, as is so often the case, leave out a crucial fact. The courts have found no discrimination in discounts for children and seniors because they are not "similarly situated" with the rest of us. Kids can't go out and earn a living and most seniors are on fixed incomes. So children and seniors aren't comparable with adults, which means treating them differently is not discrimination under the Constitution.

Ladies who party in nightclubs, however, are a different story. They belong to a group that controls over 50% of the nation's wealth and makes 80% of the purchases—not exactly a financially powerless group. Sure females make \$0.82 for every dollar that guys make, but when you consider that males work 44% longer hours than females, ladies are actually making more per hour than guys. And that doesn't even count the time at work that females spend gossiping.

Feminists also argue that girls are such a prize—as in the "princess syndrome"—that guys should feel honored to pay more to go to nightclubs where there are lots of girls. This argument assumes that Ladies' Nights actually attract more girls. Do they?

There is one sure way to tell—do a market study. To my knowledge, no nightclub in New York City has ever done such a study to determine whether Ladies' Nights actually attract more girls. Now that's strange, given the high costs of operating nightclubs and advertising. One would think a nightclub owner would want to know whether Ladies' Nights work. Perhaps they do, but differently than believed. One nightclub operator said Ladies' Nights are meant to attract guys because they mistakenly believe more girls will show. That means Ladies' Nights are simply a scheme to trick guys into nightclubs with the lure of females who never show.

Do men cause the wars?
By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.
[10.17.10]

During a trip to the evil empire—formerly the Soviet Union but still as evil as ever—a middle-aged Feminist translator sternly ended her exposition at a Moscow museum about a World War II battle with “Men cause the wars!” The American academicians and others along on the tour, including the males who were no longer men, nodded approvingly. Not me, I spoke up—“Tell that to the guys pushing up daisies in the Falklands!” Silence, no one dared argue with the truth. Margaret Thatcher started the Falklands War that killed 252 British and 655 Argentine soldiers, sailors, and airmen while doing in only three British females.

Men always die in greater numbers than females: in the Viet Nam War it was 58,185 American male combat related deaths to 8—that’s right—8 American females; in the Gulf War, 518 American men to 11 American females; and the Iraq War, 4,143 American men to 102 American females. But are guys the sole cause of that which destroys so many more of them than females? The National Organization of Witches (N.O.W.) and other modern-day groups of matriarchal tyrants would have us believe so because if men cause the wars, than they get what they deserve in war.

Condoleezza Rice, as National Security Advisor to President Bush, helped to bring about the Iraq War. As for the Gulf War, April Glassby, the American ambassador to Iraq in 1990, met with Saddam Hussein just before he invaded Kuwait. At the time, there was rising tension between Iraq and Kuwait, Iraq was mobilizing and there were reports that Saddam might move across the border. So what did April tell Saddam at their meeting—the United States had no obligation to defend Kuwait. How dumb can you get. Maybe April didn’t want to offend Saddam’s sensitivities by popping his delusion as the modern day Saladin. Whatever the reason for her stupidity, after April tells Saddam “green light,” he invades—as would any guy when a girl gives him the go-ahead—even though April might have been was thinking “red light.” What was Saddam suppose to do—read her mind? So he invades, figuring the U.S. won’t intervene because that’s what its ambassador said, and if the U.S. won’t than no one will.

The Viet Nam War had lots of contributing factors, including the 1.8 million more votes Lyndon Johnson received from females than men in 1964. Those ladies didn’t swing the election alone and Barry Goldwater might have dragged America into the same quagmire, but more girls than guys were responsible for re-electing LBJ who turned Viet Nam into a male meat grinder.

What about the big killer of men—World War II? This requires a little history—something the Feminists are excellent at ignoring or re-writing.

The treaty ending the First World War set up the League of Nations. In order for the League, like the United Nations today, to have any power required America as a member. The League ended up including most of Europe, including Germany, as well as Japan and China—but no U.S. Here’s why: President Woodrow Wilson and the leader of the Senate, Henry Cabot Lodge, had some disagreements over the League. Since the Senate would have to approve the treaty that called for U.S. membership, a compromise was crucial and likely because both men

were politicians. But when Wilson suffered a stroke, his wife, in effect, took over as President—that doomed any chance of an agreement. When was the last time you tried to reach a compromise with a female in a position of power? To such, “compromise” means only one thing—do it their way! Without the U.S., the League ultimately proved incapable of preventing aggression by the Axis Powers in the 1930s, which culminated in World War II.

Another Mistress of War was Queen Victoria with her campaigns of imperialism in Africa: the Anglo-Zulu War and the two Boer Wars. The Queen used 250,000 troops to conduct a scorched earth policy against the Boers and throw Africans and Boers into concentration camps: 27,927 Boers (of whom 22,074 were children under 16) and about 20,000 Africans died of starvation, disease and exposure. In all, about 25% of the Boer inmates and 17% of the African ones died. Concentration camps weren’t new in 1900, but under the British matriarch Victoria, they wreaked an unprecedented toll of human misery.

The Second Boer War alone cost around 75,000 lives — 22,000 British soldiers, 6,000-7,000 Boer soldiers, 20,000-28,000 Boer civilians and perhaps 25,000 Africans. The population of the world back then was 26% of what it is now, so multiply these figures by four to understand the scope of feminine barbarity.

Catherine the Great of Russia started or instigated a number of wars in order to expand her domain to the South and East into the Ottoman Empire and bite off pieces of Poland in the West. Her eminence killed plenty of men in order to add some 200,000 square miles to Russian territory, and when finished, she had bankrupted the country. The current German chancellor Angela Merkel keeps a picture of Catherine the Great in her office because, as Angela says, “Catherine was a strong woman,” which in Feminism means a destroyer of men.

There are plenty of other female tyrants throughout history who have unleashed the irrational fury of their twisted emotions when slighted, given vent to their insatiable greed, and blown mindlessly passed the chance for compromise to kill plenty of men and children. The Feminists conveniently ignored this history hoping men will do the same and buy into their con of the empathetic female leader. Don’t be fooled; they are only empathetic so long as they’re looking in the mirror. Until females have to register for the draft, and start dying in the same numbers as men do in wars that they cause, it makes no sense to make one of them Commander-in-Chief.

Russian mafia and marriage

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[12.25.10]

The Russian mafia, once a hierarchical structure under the Soviet Union, diffused with the end of Communist Party power into a confederation of crime groups that now includes Chechen, American, Cypriot, Mexican, and other nationalities. The smarter members, no longer confined to scheming for rubles, are now chasing hard currency by expanding their criminal operations to the wealthy West. Former F.B.I. Director Louis Freeh said, "Evidence that organized crime activity from Russia is expanding and will continue to expand to the United States is well-documented." *Emergency Net News Service*, May 3, 1996, Vol. 2-124.

Bringing Russian crime to Western shores requires an ongoing transfer of assets to foreign markets where the successful use of those assets requires (a) setting up and expanding Russian mafia businesses, such as prostitution, pornography, strip clubs, and drug smuggling; and (b) protecting those businesses by obstructing justice, tampering with witnesses, bribery, intimidation, and murder.

The Russian mafia in the West has created a vertically integrated business of supply, service, protection, profit maximization, and reinvestment with a huge appetite for human capital. The average Russian prostitute in the U.S. makes a relatively small amount of \$100,000 to \$150,000 tax-free a year, but considering the large number of them, the Russian syndicate is making substantial sums from the commissions the girls willingly pay. For example, the largest prostitution ring in Los Angeles' history was operated by Russian criminals, a mother and daughter team, that took in \$8 million over two years.

Operating a lucrative Russian mafia prostitution business requires the following:

Step One: Transplant willing females from Russia to the U.S. for prostitution, stripping, pornography, or procuring. Such involves the crimes of white slavery, importing an alien for immoral purposes, fraud, the misuse of visas, and eventually unlawfully acquiring citizenship. To keep customers coming back for more from an asset often means secretly slipping them drugs.

Step Two: Protecting the mafia's human capital from deportation, arrest, or imprisonment, which would ruin her money-making potential. This often requires tampering with a witness or victim, threats, bribery, and even conspiracy to commit murder-for-hire.

Step Three: Money laundering and failing to file reports on transporting dollars overseas so as to avoid paying Uncle Sam his due in taxes.

One common scheme for supplying the Russian syndicate in America with assets is tricking American men into sponsoring and financing Russian mafia prostitutes and madams for U.S. residency and citizenship through a shame marriage. Not all Russian gangsters are gruff, 220-pound weight lifters or arrogant young MBA graduates dressed in black. Many of the most dangerous look out on the world through blue eyes set in a pretty face framed with long blonde

hair. It is those mobster molls who are especially adept at exploiting human emotions of the heart for material gain.

The website www.been-scammed.com tells the story of one such mafia moll and her mobster associates, one string of events and injuries arising out of the Russian mafia's operations of transplanting prostitutes to New York and other states, passing drugs and large sums of money back and forth between countries, and threatening as well as executing reprisals against any person or business who got in the syndicate's way.

Ms-understandings about Ladies' Nights

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[12.25.10]

One criticism of lawsuits to abolish Ladies' Nights is that by not allowing girls into nightclubs for less or giving them cheaper drinks will do away with the alleged "fairer" sex in such places. It won't. The critics wrongly think that ladies don't hunt men, that girls are unwilling to pay money to catch a guy. Not so, just look at the cost of fashions, cosmetics, pedicures, and manicures. Ladies will go to the ends of the earth to find a man; they'll just make it look like the guy's doing it.

Take an informal survey by going to nightclubs that give girls a break on the price of admission and those that don't. Odds are the clubs charging both sexes the same will have a higher percentage of girls than the clubs that charge guys more. Why? Because girls believe Ladies' Nights attract lots of girls, so they'll go where there is less competition. End result is fewer girls show up for Ladies' Nights.

If there's any doubt about the hunger driving females, even Feminist females, to find a man, go to a club and stay until two or three in the morning. Look at the expressions on the faces of many young ladies as they leave—crushed because no guy hit on them, or danced with them, or asked for a telephone number. Or talk to a Feminist that spent her youth denigrating, demonizing, and blaming guys for everything that ever went wrong in her life. If she's honest, she'll admit to waking up in the middle of the night crying because she doesn't have a man—that's "man," not androgyny.

Of course, some girls proclaim they don't go to clubs to meet guys—true. They go to weasel drinks from men, dance, and boost their ego by playing the princess; otherwise, they wouldn't be taller than when they got up that morning, or their lips ruby red, or eyelashes dark and long, or eyebrows penciled, or hair a color not their own, or blouses tight and skirts short. For girls it's always about sex, because that's the power Mother Nature gave them, so unless they are lesbian, it's always about competing for men.

Most girls favor Ladies' Nights believing they deserve an economic break because they are paid less than guys. Are they? Among people who work part-time, females make 115% that of guys. In full-time jobs, the Feminist salary statistics don't account for ladies voluntarily leaving the work force while guys in the same occupation continue to work and gain valuable experience. When a wife unilaterally chooses or badgers her husband to have a child, she has three options: stay in the work force, leave it, or return to it later. The husband also has three options: work, work, and work.

N.O.W. (the National Organization of Witches) and Hillary Clinton like to cite the Government's statistic of girls earning \$0.82 for every \$1.00 guys make. But they and the statistic fail to take into account two fundamental factors—amount earned per unit of time and risk.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, men put in 44% more time at work, so when you determine the amount earned per unit of time, females are actually making more. Let's say a guy

makes \$1.00 for 60 minutes of work. A girl will then make \$0.82 but for only 42 minutes of work because she puts in less time. If she works an hour, however, she'll earn \$1.17—that's more than the guy makes.

As for risk, men are 20 times more likely to be killed or injured on the job, and suffer 95% of the job related deaths. In the 25 most dangerous occupations in America, men make up 90% of the workers—it's called the "Tombstone Basement." Low risk and, therefore, lower paying jobs are 95% occupied by girls.

Risky investments require a high enough return to compensate for the risk, and a person's occupation is one of the most important investments he'll make. Since guys are at greater risk than females: dying earlier, more injuries, hidden alimony, and paying more to enter a nightclub; they should earn more in total. So it's not a wage gap but a "risk gap," and most likely when risk is taken into account the \$1.00 to \$0.82 gap reverses, and girls end up making more than guys.

Of course, it could also be considered a "value" gap, since the real determinant of economic equality is equal pay for equal value created. For example, only a dope would spend the same amount for a ticket to a professional men's tennis match as to a pro-ladies match—unless the girls were playing in their tongs.

Girls ridicule lawsuits against Ladies' Nights as trivial because females always deride guys who fight for their rights against females in the hope such males will do what most guys do—lay down and let the girls drive over their civil liberties, perhaps in a Mercedes Benz.

Females don't want to lose the transfer of wealth from guys to them that results from Ladies' Nights. The clubs charge guys more, so they can charge girls less. Take all those guys, over all those years who paid more, and compound that extra amount semi-annually. The result is a large chunk of change transferred from the wallets of guys to the pocketbooks of girls. Is that fair, especially considering that girls control over 50% of the national wealth—I don't think so.

Some differences: males v. females

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[12.25.10]

Feminist propaganda claims that except for some mounds of flesh and “gender” organs, there’s basically no difference between guys and girls. They say females can do virtually anything men can. Perhaps, but can they do the tasks evolutionarily suited for men as well as men? Not in the real world they can’t!

Think about it. Would you waste time and money watching a bunch of females trying to play basketball when you could catch a higher quality of ball played by the NBA, men in college, or even a really good high school boys’ team? I don’t think so. Of course, if the girls played in their bikinis that’s different.

What if you needed someone to do your taxes? You’d be foolish to use a female. Studies at Vanderbilt University show that thirteen times more boys than girls score above 700 on the math part of the SAT. Why risk going to jail because some ditz got the math wrong.

Or what about investing the money for which you had to put up with so much grief to earn in an economy where over 50% of the jobs are held by females. Are you going to hand it over to some vain Feminist such as the former CEO of Hewlett Packard who spent lots of company resources and time aggrandizing herself while the stock dropped by nearly 50%?

On the other hand, when it comes to prostitution rings—invest with the madams. Los Angeles busted the largest call girl operation in its history that had raked in five to eight million in just 22 months. It was run by females: a 42 year-old Russian madam and her 22 year-old daughter. Money for sex—a girl’s natural calling.

But when it comes to the work Mother Nature made men for, girls don’t cut it. So the next time some Feminist gives you that stern, serious look—like the one your mother did when trying to tell you something that made no sense—and the Feminist says, “I’m a strong and independent woman,” meaning she’s as good and tough as a guy, ask her to step outside. “Excuse me!” She’ll indignantly respond in a tone meant to intimidate. Reply with “I’m challenging you to a duel. Let’s see how strong, independent, and tough you really are. You can even choose the weapons, so long as it’s not T & A or duplicity.” That’ll shut her up.

Taser girl
By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.
[12.25.10]

The manufacturer of Tasers advertises that “it is a woman’s product” and that women should “add the weapon to their checklist for the evening: lipstick, wallet, keys, Taser.”

Carrying a Taser is not going to protect a girl. If someone says “stick ’em up” or grabs a girl from behind, what’s she going to do, say “Wait a minute while I get my Taser out of my pocketbook,” in which she can’t find anything anyway. When someone attacks, it happens in seconds—then it’s over. The only possible defense is martial arts.

Tasers aren’t harmless. Some guy out there right now is going to die from a hair-triggered girl. She’ll use her Taser out of malice and then cry she was afraid, or make up some lie about the guy threatening her. Her Feminist lawyer and Feminist psychologist will say she’s suffering from “Taser syndrome” and blame the dead guy and men in general for making her do it. A male judge will feel sorry for her and a female judge will identify with her, and she’ll get away with murder.

The courts already recognize a number of voodoo syndromes that allow girls to murder with impunity with little or no punishment. Do we really want another one that allows a girl to zap some guy for trying to pick her up? If females are so susceptible to all those syndromes of violence, doesn’t it make sense to keep weapons out of their hands?

If girls can walk around with Tasers, then guys should be able to walk around with truncheons as deterrence to being electrocuted for disagreeing with some girl or staring at that part of her body that she chose to accentuate that day.

Then again, maybe there’s nothing to worry about. Girls are generally too uncoordinated to shoot straight, so she’ll likely hit the girl next to you.

Also, girls packing Tasers are bound to reduce the world’s number one problem—over population. Any guy is going to think more than twice before he tries to pick up a girl, since so many of them buy into the Feminist vindictiveness against men and know they can get away with just about anything so long as it harms a guy. So if you ladies want to keep guys away—carry a Taser.

The powerless girl?
By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.
[11.14.10]

Don't buy into the Feminist propaganda that girls were once powerless. Mother Nature gave them plenty of weapons: the power to use sex, sexual favors, and sympathy to win what they wanted. They've always ruled over the realm of emotions, but Feminarchy America now allows them to habitually get away with conduct they never could have before. Feminists claim the universe exempted them from civilized conduct by making them female, even though that was just an accident.

For example, has a girl—when with her date—ever summarily pushed you out of the way in a crowded night club? Has a female stampeded through you to squeeze her fat rear into a subway seat that could fit only one of her cheeks? What about cutting in line at the deli counter or mouthing off in such a vitriolic manner that if it came from a man he'd end up with a knuckle sandwich? Or take these female teachers caught having sex with their underage students. They receive no prison time or one to three years while male teachers get 15 to 20. Then there's females murdering their children without getting fried, killing their husbands and not even going to jail, or butchering incipient human beings on demand because they want the choice to act irresponsibly in satisfying their sexual whims of the moment.

The Feminists have twisted America into allowing girls to get away with more than Mother Nature intended, not because girls are superior but because females are now making the rules. We have forgotten six million years of hominid evolution: females aren't here to soothe the "savage beast"; the "savage beast" is here to limit their infinite capacity for evil. And the most virulent feminine evil is Feminism.

So what's to be done with the Feminists? Strap them to missiles and drop them on the Middle East. They'll know how to deal with them.

Who is more compassionate: male or female?

By Roy Den Hollander, Esq.

[11.14.10]

Feminist proselytizing demands we believe that girls are better suited for certain traditional male activities because they are more compassionate and caring. Those activities, of course, are only the high paying, safe, and powerful ones. But are girls really more compassionate than guys?

Take a husband and wife who both work. While driving, the wife slams into another car—not surprising, since she’s running her mouth on a cell phone and between breaths and gibberish, she’s sucking down a cafe latte. She ends up in the hospital for weeks. The family income is cut, but the husband’s main concern is that she’s okay and gets well. He knows they’ll make it through the financial crunch.

Reverse the situation. The husband is broadsided by some lady yakking on her cell phone and sipping a cafe latte. The accident, more like recklessness, sends him to the hospital for weeks. The wife’s only concerns are the impact on her of the loss of income and sex. Sex is a concern, unless she’s an adulteress—something many wives are until men no longer find them attractive. The reduction in cash flow, however, is probably her main worry, since it’s needed to keep her in the lifestyle to which she is accustomed.

While this example shows females as being less compassionate than men, it does show them as equals in one sense: both are primarily concerned about the wife.

Please go to www.roydenhollander.com for the men’s rights cases brought by the author.